

The Sermons of this series now published

are as follows:

No. 1. "Confession and Absolution,"
By the Rev. Father Maturin.

No. 2. "The Seven Words from the Cross,"
By the Rev. Father Maturin.

No. 3. "Prayers for the Departed,"
By the Rev. Father Hall.

No. 4. "Charity,"
By the Rev. Father Maturin.

No. 5. "Reading the Bible,"
By the Rev. Father Hall.

No. 6. "Ritualism,"
By the Rev. Father Maturin.

May be had at the Church, Twentieth and Cherry Sts., Philadelphia.
McCauly's Book Store, 108 South 12th St., Phila.
Hammond's Book Store, 1224 Chestnut St., Phila.
B. F. Holl, 410 Arch Street, Phila.
Alonzo Tilden, 408 Commerce Street, Phila.
Jas. Pott & Co., 12 Astor Place, New York.
Mission House of the Society of St. John the Evangelist,
44 Temple Street, Boston, Mass.

PRICE, FIVE CENTS EACH.

NOTE.—For the purpose of supplying a want very generally felt in the Parish, the Sermons of this series have been printed from shorthand notes, taken under the direction of certain members of the Vestry, who, alone, are answerable for all errors—the Rector kindly giving his consent, without assuming any responsibility—as the sermons preached in this church are not prepared with a view to publication.

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY

St. Clement's Pulpit.

Sermon Series.

No. 6.

Ritualism.

A Sermon preached (in substance) at St. Clement's Church,
Philadelphia,
at the night service,
on Rogation Sunday, April 29th, 1883,
By the Rev. FATHER MATURIN, Rector.

(Stenographically reported, by Mr. T. A. Feustermaker.)

1. Peter ii, 15. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.

THREE were two great enemies which assailed the Church at the moment of her birth. On the one hand Heathenism, on the other Judaism. Heathenism with its huge multitudes massed together and held by social, political, and religious bonds, in one strong compact body, a great cloud of superstitious fear resting upon all and easily used as a power to startle men to the most cruel acts of per-

secution. On the other hand Judaism, contrary in all respects to Heathenism, yet like her in her hatred of Christianity. Heathenism many-sided, broad in its toleration and wide as the world in its nationality; Judaism narrow, exclusive, and national; yet both combined to drive Christianity out of the world.

And the hatred of Judaism and of Heathenism sprung from widely different causes. Heathenism was to a certain extent, ready to accept the God of the Christians, as one amongst many; a Heathen Emperor placed the image of Christ in the Pantheon. Heathenism would be willing to let Christianity alone, but it saw before long that it must either yield itself up to Christianity or drive it out. It was the intolerance of Christianity which aroused the opposition of Heathenism. Here was a religion of yesterday, without letters, or social position, or men of intellect, which was claiming boldly to be the sole teacher of Truth, and whose one object and aim was to make converts. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature,"—this, they claimed, was their commission. "We can't be at peace with the many religions around us," they said. "God has come down from Heaven to teach us the truth, and we cannot but preach those things which we have seen and heard." By its very claim to have a Revelation, it must be intolerant, it must make enemies; and therefore, it soon became evident that there must be deadly war between the old religions and the new. Heathenism must drive Christianity out of the world, or it will be driven out itself.

On the other hand, there was the hatred of Judaism. And why? For this reason, that Christianity claimed to be the legitimate outcome and representative of Judaism. She claimed that Judaism had done her work and had no longer a place in the world; that "the Law was the schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." Now Christ has come, the schoolmaster is no longer needed. She opened the Scriptures and pointed out how in prophecy and type and figure and

sacrifice Christ was prefigured. She boldly claimed the Jewish scriptures as her own, and that she was the tree of which Judaism was the seed. Therefore, Judaism had but one thing to do—to yield herself up to Christianity or to drive her forth.

If only the Christian Church had had a little more, worldly wisdom, and had been a little less intolerant, she might have had a painless childhood and youth, and have existed on friendly terms alongside of Heathenism and Judaism; but she had that strange short-sightedness, that obstinate stupidity, if you please, that only saw one thing, and acted upon that, let the consequences be what they may. "I am right, and I know it," she said; and she was not afraid to add, "therefore you are wrong, and I would willingly compass sea and land to make one proselyte."

But there was another feeling, which was not, perhaps, expressed, but which was very deeply felt, as Christianity spread wider and wider and drew more and more of her numbers away,—a feeling which is not altogether unknown to-day in certain quarters; I mean *panic*. The Jewish Church began to tremble for its existence. Wise men, in time, began to feel that the day of Judaism had gone by; that the fire of her divine enthusiasm had well-nigh burnt out. She would look upon her decreasing numbers, and feel herself powerless to awaken the zeal and devotion that once was her pride. Some of the aged men still lived on, but where were the rising men of the future? Where were the leaders of the coming generation? She looked upon this rising body in her midst, "this sect," as she called it, "everywhere spoken against;" quoting her Scriptures, claiming to be of her, yet so utterly different in spirit and in tone, and she saw the young blood was there. She could not hide it from herself, though she might not acknowledge it. It was a growing power, a vast spreading influence, far out of proportion to its numbers and position. There was but one thing to be done to it,—it must be crushed.

And from this two-fold reason, then, Judaism was determined to drive Christianity out of the world. Whether it might be doing good or not, whether it might have something to say for itself or not, was a different question, but for the existence of Judaism, "It was expedient that Christianity should perish."

The result of all this was that before long it began to be generally believed that the Christians were a very bad set of people. Somehow or other, if people in authority dislike a cause, the feeling is apt to spread; the multitudes for the most part allow their thinking to be done for them by the few, especially in religious matters, they do but echo the opinions of those whom they think competent to judge, and so it came to pass that there was a very general and strong feeling against this new sect. Whence it sprang or what was its cause, many had not an idea, but they had a strong *prejudice* against it; they felt there must be something wrong about it or people would not feel as they did and speak as they did against it. In a few years there were the most shocking stories circulated and believed on all sides of the immorality of the Christians, of their nightly orgies, at which they sacrificed and eat the flesh of an infant; and good people, without looking into the matter for themselves, no doubt believed all the fearful things they heard, and avoided and forced those under their care to avoid, having anything to do with this sect that was everywhere and most deservedly spoken against,—members of a church that repudiated them, members of a state whose laws they violated, in open revolt against the religious and civil authorities, and drawing their converts from the lowest and most unlettered of the people. Where prejudice was so widely spread and such stories were reported on all sides, where almost everyone in authority was warning against them and they said not a word in self-defence, was it a wonder that they should be hated and that the question should be asked, "Why don't the authorities put them down?" "Why are

such men allowed to act in open defiance of law and decency?"

It is a good thing for us, my brethren, sometimes to look back after the lapse of many centuries at some time of great religious excitement; we can learn lessons not unprofitable to our own times. We can look back calmly through the ages that intervene and pass our judgment and learn our lesson. There was the Church in the midst of all that passion, prejudice and persecution. What could she do? She knew what people said was untrue; but who can argue down prejudice and how can passion be answered? She knew that certain things were said which had some foundation of truth but were grossly exaggerated and misrepresented, but could not be absolutely contradicted, and so what did she do? She simply did nothing but quietly went her way trying to do what her Master gave her to do, and to bear all she had to bear. She took to herself the exhortation of St. Peter, and sought "by well-doing to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." She did not try to right herself in the eyes of the world—to explain away misrepresentations to repudiate-slanders. She simply and calmly went her way, struggling against the powers of the world and the devil, remembering that her warfare was not carnal but spiritual, and that her weapons therefore must also be spiritual; and she has won the battle. She fought her way through all that strong and compact force that opposed her. She lived down the prejudice and opposition, and in three hundred years she had converted the Empire. We look back now, my brethren, we who are the heirs of her victories, and we wonder people could have been such fools as to believe such nonsense as was spoken against her. We marvel when we read that intelligent and thoughtful men could attribute all the trouble that came upon the Empire to the magic and impiety of the Christians. Yet so it was, in spite of prejudice, in spite of argument; in spite of false rumors, in spite of open lying, the Catholic Church has won the day, and gathered into her fold the descendants of those who were once her most bitter opponents.

It is a good thing for us, I think, sometimes to look back to those days of the Church's infancy, and to see the enemies she had to meet and the way she met them, for prejudice, my brethren, is just as powerful and just as hard to meet to-day as it was eighteen hundred years ago, and it has that same impalpable way of rising up like an atmosphere and surrounding us so that it is breathed in by the multitudes. We don't kill people nowadays for their religious beliefs. It's the boast of this age that men are free to believe or not believe whatever they please; but if their faith is against the current of the times they can be made to endure a good share of petty persecution and unpleasant and unmerciful ridicule, and what I want you to bear in mind is this: The widest prejudice and the greatest antagonism *may* exist against a certain form of faith, and yet that *may* be the only representative of the truth. So it was with Christianity upon its entrance into the world, and whatever may chance to be the way in which the age meets that form of faith against which it is prejudiced will, of course, be turned against it. Of old it was persecution; now it's ridicule. Therefore, because a religious cause is widely ridiculed, and, as a consequence, various rumors afloat about it, this *in itself* is no reason against it. Might we not almost say, from analogy, a presumption in its favor. Judaism, hitherto the true religion of those days, and Heathenism, the untrue religion, both were united against the Catholic Church; yet the Catholic Church was right.

Therefore, my brethren, don't allow yourself to be blinded by prejudice. Don't believe all you hear against religious practices which are not popular. Be reasonable enough when you hear silly stories, which may perhaps seem to have some foundation, to say: "I won't believe that till I have tested it." For it is a fact that where religious prejudice exists people are ready to say and believe almost anything.

Now, those who have been called by the unpleasant nickname of Ritualists have two classes of opponents: one

outside the Episcopal Church and the other within. Let me say, first of all, one word in regard to the first class of opponents. What we do or leave undone is no business of theirs. They don't like externals, they say, and it does harm, and arouses opposition. I should simply answer to them, be good enough to keep to your own church then; it never occurs to me for a moment, in the conduct of divine service, to ask, will this or that offend any Presbyterian or Methodist or Baptist who may chance to be present. I have no responsibility towards them. If they like to come to our service they are quite welcome; if they don't like it they can stay away. I don't imagine all the various denominations will modify their services to meet the tastes of any Episcopalians or Roman Catholics who may happen to come to their churches. Nor do we even for a moment take them into consideration. My duty as a Priest is to my own people and my own church, not to those who have broken with us and formed a church of their own. But, they say, you aren't true to your own church or prayer-book; you do things that your prayer-book doesn't permit. My only answer is, I am not going to defend my acts to those who are outside of my church; there are within the church the proper authorities, if they think I am doing wrong they can stop me, I suppose, if they see fit.

Then there are those *in* the Episcopal Church who, perhaps, are the most bitter of all in their opposition. Now, I am quite sure that they never say one word against Ritualism which they believe to be untrue. I have not the least doubt that in their fiercest opposition they are perfectly sincere (though they must forgive me for saying, that, notwithstanding their sincerity, a great many things they say are absolutely and entirely untrue); but, I think, that, as a body, perhaps quite unconsciously, they are also moved by those two feelings which I referred to at the beginning as causing the opposition of Judaism. 1. They feel,—if we are true, they must be untrue. We quote the prayer-book and rubrics for

all we do. We profess to teach what the Episcopal Church teaches, and what they, for some reasons known to themselves, prefer to pass over in silence. We openly challenge those in authority, "If we are wrong, why don't you stop us?" We say to our opponents, "You are the majority. You can make rubrics and canons, and alter the prayer-book; if you think the prohibition of our practices are not distinct enough, why don't you make them more stringent?" We are quite ready to obey if the command issues from proper authority. But all the answer we receive is hard names, accusations of unfaithfulness and dishonesty, and so far as possible being pushed into the background. But, with all their numbers and influence, nothing is done, and we calmly go on our way. 2. Then there is the other feeling which may unconsciously waken opposition within the church, and that is *panic*. People are beginning to feel that, with all that is against us, we are making our way, and gradually leavening the church. They feel that the life, the energy, the zeal, and the work is on our side. They can't revive the fire and the unction that was in the Evangelical school sixty years ago. It's gone. There certainly are hoary heads and wrinkled brows amongst them, but they are beginning to ask where are the men of the future, upon whom shall the mantle of our Elijahs fall? I have heard it said of the Ritualists, "you are all young men; there's not an old man amongst you." I don't think it's true, but, at any rate, I should prefer to have such an accusation, than that it should be said as, I think, we may retort, "you are all old men; there's not a young man amongst you." And if there are a few here and there, they have taken up with practices that make the older men shake their heads at such want of consistency and thoroughness. Why, my brethren, you know yourselves there are things done in this diocese and in representative low church parishes, and by men in important positions, for which, a few years ago, the so-called Ritualist had to suffer.

Thus, the Ritualists have a good deal of opposition to endure both from without and from members of their own

church; from a combination of causes, they are unpopular with those in authority, they are hated by the old-fashioned school which was not over-serupulous as to a strict adherence to the Prayer-book and is pleased to stigmatize those usages which the Prayer-book orders, or at least countenances, but which it frowns upon, as "innovations;" and the result is that a great many things are said and believed about them, which are not true; indeed, there is nothing too absurd or too extravagant not to be believed. I heard once in a convention of this diocese, a Priest of high standing and influence describe in graphic language and sad cadences a service which he imagined to have taken place in St. Clement's Church. He told that assembled body that on Maundy-Thursday we rent in pieces a garment and handed the fragments round amongst the congregation in remembrance or rather, he might have said, as a burlesque of that solemn fulfillment of prophecy at the foot of the cross "they parted my garments amongst them;" doubtless that body, which on that occasion, if I remember rightly, were sitting in judgment upon our imagined misdemeanors, were filled with indignation at such an unprecedented performance, and with pity for the bad taste and irreverence that prompted it, and I have no doubt that both the speaker and hearers fully believed that we did as was described.

One thing, indeed, which is commonly said of us and widely believed, and which goes far to awaken or deepen prejudice, is that our whole care is for externals, the very nickname which people have chosen for us carries this stigma on the face of it. It hardly needs to say more than that a man is a Ritualist to imply that he is superficial and without religious depth. What faith, people ask, can you have in a man who cares more for the color and shape of a vestment than for the souls of his people, who will arouse ill-feeling and destroy the harmony and peace of his parish for the sake of some meaningless and unedifying forms, and who sets law and his ordination vows at naught for things that are so

trivial and worthless? Most men do recognize and value earnestness and sincerity when they meet it, even though it may show itself in mistaken ways, but what looks like superficiality in matters so sacred rouses their righteous indignation. Now I would ask them to bear in mind that the name they call us we repudiate and hate. We are not Ritualists. We don't call ourselves by such a name, nor recognize it. For externals as externals we don't care the least. I don't think it would be worth a moment's thought what one should wear in celebrating the Holy Communion, if no meaning were attached it. It would not be worth while wakening the prejudice of the most ignorant by the practice of any form whose only object was to satisfy the taste for the beautiful. Some persons may naturally be moved by what is beautiful in the conduct of the service; others may feel it interfere with their devotions; but if its only purpose were even to act as a help, perhaps the gain would not be worth the loss. But, my brethren, this is not the reason; it's not as a matter of taste or as a help to devotion, or for the mere love of the beautiful, that we do these things. It is because of their meaning. People say, Do you really think it's worth wakening up all this bitter feeling and turning people away from your church and causing so much discord and making so many enemies for the sake of some trifling act, such as bending the knee or bowing the head? I answer it, as is quite possible, that is to symbolize a great doctrine, I certainly do; I think it would be worth dying for. It was on some such trifling act that the martyr's life often hung. What was the throwing a little incense before an image of an emperor? Nothing, except that every one knew what it implied; and, my brethren, it has often been on some trifling act that the greatest principles have depended. Now the external acts of worship or ritual in the Church may be of very little importance in themselves, but if it is well known that by these acts certain doctrines are implied; that, for instance, by certain acts of

reverence, a belief in the doctrine of the Real Presence is shown forth, then it will be no longer a question of taste, but of principle, whether those acts are performed; and this is the chief reason for what we do. We are struggling, not for the restoration of an ornate service, but for *doctrines*; and under these external forms we teach them, and people can't help *feeling* them. Preach loudly from the pulpit the doctrine of the Real Presence, and then celebrate in a manner devoid of all external sign of devotion, and people won't believe what you preach; but *here*, my brethren, we preach from the pulpit by word of mouth; *there* at the altar we preach even more plainly by act, and this is worth fighting for and suffering for, if we believe it to be true. People may sneer and say, these foolish men are awakening all this dissension and bitterness for trifles; but it's not for trifles; it's not for the external thing, but for what it typifies and what it is known to mean. And this, indeed, is the secret of the persecution from the leaders of the opposition; *they* know full well what it means; to the multitudes, who only judge superficially, it may seem to be awakening prejudice for nothing, but these know that our object has been to teach doctrine through external symbolism, to bring home to the worshiper through every sense the doctrine we believe; to take our whole nature into our worship and help faith through all that can impress the mind. Of course, I know there are some persons who join themselves on to the movement without either understanding what we are doing or entering into the spirit of our work, who are attracted by what they see, and take up with certain external acts, and that is all; who may well be called "Ritualists," because they are attracted by the Ritual and nothing more; but these men and women are not helping our cause, nor, indeed, do they do anything but hinder us: they are the greatest enemies to the cause they profess to love. The reverence of the body must proceed from and be the expression of the reverence of the mind, or

it is worthless. It can be no honor to God to pay Him outward acts of reverence while abstaining from all those inward acts which are more secret but more difficult. I don't care much whether a man bows his head at the right time and the right place, and in the most correct manner or not, but I care a great deal whether he does those more practical things which are the proper results of his faith. It makes me indignant to see a man go through a great deal of outward expression of worship at Holy Communion, and then make his communion in the middle of the day after he has had his breakfast; to hear a man discoursing on the proper manner of conducting the service, when I know he has never been to confession. I should say to such men, begin from *within*; don't use these outward things till you are certain you believe what they represent; don't outwardly seem to accept what you don't in your heart believe, or at least practice; don't do anything that is not *real*. I don't want to see my congregation drilled to an exact external uniformity. I don't care whether you bow your head or sign yourself with the sign of the Cross, or turn yourself to the East or not. I'd rather you didn't begin at first with these things; many of them might be unreal, but there will not be much unreality about them when you have first practiced the more hidden and difficult parts. I don't think an outward act of reverence will be very unreal to you if you have perhaps fasted till one or two o'clock in the day out of reverence to our Lord's presence, which you receive. I don't think outward expressions of penitence will be very unreal if you go through the humiliation of making your confession; but to talk a great deal about external acts of devotion, to use certain slang expressions, and talk in a superficial and irreverent way about doctrines which in your heart you don't believe, this can do nothing but grievous harm to yourself and those who hear you. And this, my brethren, no doubt has done our cause some harm; but these persons are not working with us; they are, indeed, our

greatest enemies, and many a misrepresentation and false accusation from which we have suffered can be traced back to them.

Our purpose is not to satisfy the taste for the beautiful, not merely to restore an ornate service and make the worship of God as beautiful as it ought to be; this is but a very minor part of our purpose; our one great object is to teach the faith; it's a matter of very little importance in itself whether the Priest preaches in a surplice or cossack or gown. I have often preached without either surplice or gown in a case of necessity. I shouldn't hesitate to preach in a coat. If I were preaching in a church where it was customary to preach in a gown I shouldn't mind in the least doing it, though there is certainly no authority for its use in the Prayer-book; or again it seems to me in *itself* a matter of very little importance, whether the choir be in surplices or not; doubtless it looks more seemly and becoming that they should be properly vested, but if that is all, if all the object of our endeavors be to have the externals of worship beautiful and attractive to the eye and ear, then I think it is simply a matter of taste and not worth the struggle; certainly not worth awakening opposition; when one hears of a church adopting such things as choral service, surpliced choir, and having the church handsomely decorated, but ending all their improvements there, having no additional celebrations of the Holy Communion nor Early Communions, no doctrinal teaching, then, my brethren, I think the cause for rejoicing very small; indeed, I question whether such improvements do not do more harm in a certain sense than good. Such changes are deservedly called "Ritualistic" and nothing more; they mean nothing; the people are taught nothing by them, and some of them would seem to have a perfect right to say, what's the use of all these changes; I prefer the old-fashioned way; I can't join in the service any more; and the answer which their pastor ought to give them should be, there is no meaning whatever in any of these changes; they have no significance; it is simply

that it suits my taste more; this is Ritualism indeed; but we who are called Ritualists *have* an object in the changes we make, and are not afraid to tell what the object is; and I think that our congregations understand what they mean, and that they do not lay any stress upon externals if they are only to be externals.

Ask the communicants of this parish which, if they had to choose, they would prefer, that we should give up the grand services, such as we have at Easter and Christmas, with all their music and ornament, or the daily celebration of the Holy Communion, and I don't think there are many of them that would hesitate to say: Above all things let us have the reality, let us have the daily communion. Ask them whether they would accept the compromise that we should give up the teaching of the Real Presence and the practice of confession and keep all the Ritual or add to it, and I think I am confident of the answer: We don't want the Ritual if it doesn't mean anything. But, my brethren, if one object and work of the so-called Ritualists is to teach doctrine through external symbolism—we do not merely teach by acts, we teach also by word of mouth—one characteristic of the movement has been plain and simple preaching.

We have taken the Prayer-book in its entirety and we *believe* it all, and therefore are not afraid to teach it all: first we know exactly what we believe ourselves and then we try to teach it to others in as plain and intelligible language as we know how to use. The Prayer-book bids us say to each separate communicant as we hand them the Sacrament: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ; the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." We believe that what we say in that solemn moment is true, and therefore we teach it, and as I say, we teach it in language that will convey to the mind of our hearers what we mean.

The Prayer-book bids us say every morning and evening: "God hath given power and commandment to His

ministers to declare and pronounce to His people being penitent the Absolution and remission of their sins;" and again, if any person cannot quiet their own conscience, they are to come to some "discreet and learned minister of God's Word and open his grief;" and therefore, we teach people that they may come and open their grief to us, and that we have authority and power to declare Absolution, and we further tell them that on certain days and at certain hours we can be found in church for this purpose. The Prayer-book says that certain days are to be observed as fasts and we therefore teach the people to observe them.

When I preach to you, my brethren, on any doctrine, there are always three thoughts in my mind: 1. The doctrine itself, what it is that I believe about it. 2. That I do not speak merely with the power of personal influence, but that I have behind my words the authority of the Church, whose commission I bear and whom for the time I represent; that I am perfectly sure that what I say, I have right and authority to say; that I am not merely suggesting certain matters for your consideration, but telling you what I have been authorized to teach. And 3. How shall I best and most simply bring this home to your mind that you may thoroughly understand what it is I have meant to teach. If I wish to teach you that the Church has given me the power to absolve sins and you the right to seek it at my hands, I try to put it before you in such plain, simple and forcible terms as will leave you without any doubt that I believe it myself, and that I wish to convince you of it, also. It seems hardly worth dwelling on so very natural a thing, and one that we should expect every man to do, and yet, my brethren, it is only our experience that tells us it is by no means so common as we might expect. I know many clergymen, who from the pulpit when they speak on doctrinal subjects for the most part tell their people what they are *not* to believe, but when it comes to what they *are* to believe all is hazy and indefinite. They are very plain-spoken in the language they use against Confession and Abso-

lution, but very indefinite or altogether silent upon such a text as "Whosoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven; whosoever sins ye retain they are retained;" they are loud in their denunciation of the doctrine of prayers for the dead, but when they would speak of the Communion of Saints, which is an article of their creed, they leave their congregation with very great doubts as to what they mean them to believe; they don't hesitate to tell their people that the doctrine of the Real Presence leads to idolatry; but what they *are* to believe about the Holy Eucharist is presented in such mystical language as "touching the hem of Christ's garment," or being on "the threshold of Heaven," which leaves people absolutely in the dark as to what they are to believe. Now, the so-called Ritualist, on the contrary, takes his Bible in one hand, and his Prayer-book in the other, and by the authority of his Prayer-book he teaches the meaning of certain passages in the Bible which may seem difficult or obscure.

Therefore, "he teaches as one that hath authority;" not as one who "worships he knows not what," but as one "who knows what he worships." And, as I say, he tries to send his people away after hearing him preach with a clear representation before their minds of what he has meant to say. People *want* to be taught. There is a real thirst for knowledge, a craving to know what is the truth; and people are ignorant, more ignorant than many of us think. Many educated men and women are ignorant of the very first principles of the faith; they don't like to confess their ignorance, therefore, they shrink from seeking instruction personally, but they hungrily seek for instruction when it can be had. People are weary of hearing moral essays on Sundays; there is a cry of unsatisfied and uneducated faith, "tell me what am I to believe;" the very readiness to believe the most strange and unreasonable doctrines, testifies to this desire, and they naturally listen with eagerness to plain and

simple teaching, but not only because it is plain and simple, but because it is spoken with authority.

They do not care for, nor trust, nor respect clergymen who on Sundays reflect to them their own mild views on faith and morals; they will respect a man who is not afraid of them, who is entirely independent of the most influential or most prejudiced of them all, who knows what his business is, knows his lofty and responsible position, and is ready in the teeth of prejudice, opposition, and his own worldly interest to speak the plain truth in the plain language of one who believes in that divine commission: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations;" "woe is me," he says, "if I preach not the *gospel*;" and the gospel from the time it was preached by Christ Himself, down to the present day, has always aroused the prejudice and hatred of one class of its hearers.

This, then, I think, is one great power, one great work of the so-called Ritualists. They believe in themselves and their cause; they know that they are not dependent for success upon numbers, or personal influence, or intellectual power, but upon the truth of their cause, that what they teach they teach with the authority of their church. And so their words have force,—the double force of personal conviction and of authority. They are not afraid to say what they believe. They have no need to temporize, for they know that there is nothing to be gained. They have to endure being misunderstood and misrepresented; they are called disloyal to their church, dishonest, insubordinate, slighted by those in authority, snubbed by their brethren in the Priesthood, assured that to believe what the Prayer-book teaches is sufficient reason to keep them from any position of authority in the church they love. All this is not pleasant. It would be much easier to stifle one's convictions and one's conscience, and to walk with the multitude, but, my brethren, at least they have this satisfaction, that, with all this opposition within forty, nay, twenty years, they have

leavened the whole Anglican communion. Quietly, but steadily, one point after another has been gained. The whole church has been awakened from its slumber; legislation has been tried, but the weapon has only wounded those who formed it. The Church has been appealed to again and again in her councils, and she has only either silently or actually indorsed what the Ritualists have done. We look forward confidently to the future. The truth will conquer. More has been done in our own day than we could have fancied in our most sanguine dreams, and more still will be done in the future. What is it, my brethren, you and I are contending for and hoping for and watching—this church putting on a surpliced choir, that church having a choral service, and the other church discarding the black gown? No! If that is all they have or do I don't care. What we look for and believe will come is the clear teaching, by word and act, of what the church believes, of what the Prayer-book teaches, and the church's restored discipline, whereby she will enforce this teaching. It is a privilege to be allowed to take any part, however small, in so glorious a work; and with all who so believe a great responsibility rests. Let us preach by action rather than words. Let us endeavor to show by our lives that the sacraments are channels of grace and power. Let us bear witness by silence more often than speech, and let us lay to heart the teaching of St. Peter, "So is the will of God that by well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men."